

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE
IN AND FOR NEW CASTLE COUNTY**

STATE OF DELAWARE)	
)	
)	
v.)	ID#: 0611011396
)	
KEINO CHRICHLOW,)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

**Upon Defendant's Third Motion for Postconviction Relief –
*SUMMARILY DISMISSED.***

1. On March 28, 2012, the court denied Defendant's second motion for postconviction relief.

2. Thereafter, on September 17, 2013, Defendant filed a request for appointment of counsel, which the court denied by order docketed November 14, 2013.

3. Finally, for present purposes, Defendant filed this, his third motion for postconviction relief. After proper referral¹ and preliminarily consideration,² it appears the motion is subject to summary dismissal because it is repetitive and previously adjudicated. It further appears that Defendant has not shown cause or prejudice overcoming his procedural default.³ And, after further consideration of the

¹
²
³

record it does not appear that further review is warranted in the interest of justice or to address an issue of Constitutional dimension.

4. At this time, the court and The Supreme Court of Delaware have written about this case extensively. It stems from an elaborate bank robbery where bank employees and customers were held at gun-point. Defendant was the getaway driver.

5. In his previous motions, Defendant has raised questions about his having been found guilty based on the liability of the actual robbers. And, these points have been addressed. The current claims are almost identical to his earlier ones. To the limited extent, if any, the claims has been refined or presented in a slightly different way. They should have been part of Defendant's earlier motions. The rule governing postconviction relief practice,⁴ does not contemplate serial motions including where the same claims are presented initially and refined through subsequent practice.⁵

6. As mentioned above, the courts have reviewed and re-reviewed Defendant's conviction. With that and Defendant's latest claims in mind, it cannot be said that further review warranted in the interest of justice, nor that Defendant has presented a claim involving a Constitutional error.

⁴ Super Ct. Crim. Rule 61. ??

For the foregoing reasons, Defendant's third motion for postconviction relief is **SUMMARILY DISMISSED**. Prothonotary **SHALL** notify Defendant.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: May 6, 2014

/s/ Fred S. Silverman
Judge

oc: Prothonotary, (Criminal Division)
pc: Josette D. Manning, Deputy Attorney General
Keino S. Chrichlow, Defendant